

Please note that this statement tracks all Notices of Motion submitted by members, until the point of disposal. The motion will remain on the statement until the Committee has agreed to remove it.

ENTERPRISE, PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE

MOTIONS LIST

11 SEPTEMBER 2012

<u>No.</u>	<u>Motion</u>	<u>Date of Council Meeting</u>	<u>Committee Motion referred to / date/ decision of Committee</u>	<u>Action taken / Proposed Future Action</u>	<u>Responsible Head(s) of Service</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Is authority sought to remove motion from list?</u>
1.	<p><u>Motion by Councillor Yuill</u></p> <p>“That Aberdeen City Council agrees to instruct officers to prepare a report on both the feasibility of developing, in partnership with Aberdeenshire Council and Perth and Kinross Council, a long distance footpath – The Royal Deeside and Perthshire Way – from Fittie to Perth via Deeside and ways in which this project might be funded.”</p>	27.04.11	<p><u>Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure 13.09.11</u></p> <p>Amongst, other things, to request officers to participate in the Royal Deeside, Angus and Perthshire Way Steering Group which was already discussing the establishment of the “Pictish Way”, and that officers report back to the next meeting of the Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee regarding the terms of the motion, and in particular detailing the outstanding aspects required to establish and signpost the proposed “Pictish Way”, as well as the financial cost of achieving this.</p>	<p>At its meeting on 31 January 2012, the Committee resolved to:-</p> <p>(i) instruct officers to monitor developments on the Pictish Way by partners and attend Steering Group meetings (so far held in Forfar) where resources allowed; and</p> <p>(ii) instruct officers to report back to the Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee after the summer recess on the findings of a report that Angus Council intended to commission into the development of the route.</p> <p>Recommendation (b) of the report EPI/12/030 to the 31st January meeting was that officers report</p>	Head of Planning and Sustainable Development	31.05.12	No

<u>No.</u>	<u>Motion</u>	<u>Date of Council Meeting</u>	<u>Committee Motion referred to / date/ decision of Committee</u>	<u>Action taken / Proposed Future Action</u>	<u>Responsible Head(s) of Service</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Is authority sought to remove motion from list?</u>
				back to this Committee on the findings of a feasibility study commissioned by Angus Council. A finalised copy of that study is not yet available however, and a meeting of the Steering Group made up of the various authorities involved, to discuss the findings and agree a way forward, is yet to take place. It is therefore proposed that a report will be presented to the 6th November meeting.			
2.	<u>Motion by Councillor Yuill</u> “That, given the ongoing difficulties caused by HGVs using Broomhill Road as a through route, Council instructs officers to report to the appropriate committee on the introduction of an ‘except for access’ weight or width restriction on some or all of Broomhill Road between Holburn Street	17.08.11	<u>Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure 13.09.11</u> To request officers to report on the terms of the motion to a future meeting of the Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee.	At its meeting on 31 January 2012, the Committee resolved to request officers to explore other options available, not excluding the introduction of an “except for access” width and/or weight restriction, to address the concerns of residents on Broomhill Road, and to report back to a future meeting of the Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee on these options, as well as the implications of the	Head of Asset Management and Operations	31.5.12	No

<u>No.</u>	<u>Motion</u>	<u>Date of Council Meeting</u>	<u>Committee Motion referred to / date/ decision of Committee</u>	<u>Action taken / Proposed Future Action</u>	<u>Responsible Head(s) of Service</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Is authority sought to remove motion from list?</u>
	and South Anderson Drive.”			<p>introduction of each.</p> <p>At its meeting on 31 May 2012, the Committee resolved to:-</p> <p>(a) agree that, given the strategic importance of Broomhill Road within the road network and the proportionately small percentage of HGVs that were using Broomhill Road as a through route, restricting LGVs/HGVs along Broomhill Road would not be appropriate;</p> <p>(b) agree that no action be taken at this time; and</p> <p>(c) and to request officers to undertake further speed, volume and parking surveys on Broomhill Road following the implementation of the new puffin crossing and report back to the Committee with this information.</p>			
3.	<u>Motion by Councillor Yuill</u>	17.08.11	<u>Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure 13.09.11</u>	At its meeting on 31 January 2012, the Committee resolved to defer	Head of Asset Management and Operations	31.1.12	Yes

<u>No.</u>	<u>Motion</u>	<u>Date of Council Meeting</u>	<u>Committee Motion referred to / date/ decision of Committee</u>	<u>Action taken / Proposed Future Action</u>	<u>Responsible Head(s) of Service</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Is authority sought to remove motion from list?</u>
	<p>“That, given the ongoing difficulties caused by lorries using Morningside Road, Cranford Road and Duthie Terrace as through routes so as to avoid the junction of Great Western Road and South Anderson Drive, Council instructs officers to report to the appropriate committee on the introduction of an ‘except for access’ weight restriction on these roads plus that part of Hammerfield Avenue not already covered by such a restriction.”</p>		<p>To request officers to report on the terms of the motion to a future meeting of the Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee.</p>	<p>a decision on the report and request officers to contact BEAR Scotland regarding the possible reconfiguration of the junction from Great Western Road to Anderson Drive, and to report back to a future meeting of the Committee in this regard.</p> <p>At its meeting on 31 May 2012, the Committee resolved to:-</p> <p>(a) agree to take no action at this time given the low volume of large/heavy goods vehicles using these roads and the level of resources that would be required to ensure compliance with the traffic order restricting such vehicles; and</p> <p>(b) request officers to continue to monitor the level of usage of these roads by HGVs on an annual basis and if there should be a significant change reconsider the possibility of introducing a restriction.</p>			
4.	<u>Motion by Councillor Yuill</u>	17.08.11	<u>Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure 13.09.11</u>	At its meeting on 31 January 2012, the	Head of Asset Management	31.5.12	Yes

<u>No.</u>	<u>Motion</u>	<u>Date of Council Meeting</u>	<u>Committee Motion referred to / date/ decision of Committee</u>	<u>Action taken / Proposed Future Action</u>	<u>Responsible Head(s) of Service</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Is authority sought to remove motion from list?</u>
	<p>“That, given the significant inconvenience and difficulties caused to householders and others by bollards opposite the entrance from Deeside Drive to the rear lane lying between the rear of properties on Deeside Drive and Deeside Crescent, Council instructs officers to report to the appropriate committee on the removal of these bollards.”</p>		<p>To request officers to report on the terms of the motion to a future meeting of the Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee.</p>	<p>Committee resolved to defer consideration of the report and to request officers to explore alternative solutions to the difficulties experienced by the bollards opposite the entrance to Deeside Lane and report back to a future meeting of the Committee in this regard.</p> <p>At its meeting on 31 May 2012, the Committee resolved to:-</p> <p>(a) note the proposals that officers had considered; and</p> <p>(b) agree that no further action should be taken with regard to the removal of the bollards as this could not be justified due to the costs of the associated works.</p>	and Operations		
5.	<p><u>Motion by former Councillor Farquharson</u></p> <p>“Council is asked to set up a working party to explore the possibility of changing the whole</p>	6.10.11	<p><u>Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure 15.11.11</u></p> <p>To request officers to submit a report on the terms of the motion to a future meeting of the</p>	<p>At its meeting on 31 January 2012, the Committee resolved to request officers to report back a future meeting of the Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee</p>	Head of Asset Management and Operations	31.5.12	No

<u>No.</u>	<u>Motion</u>	<u>Date of Council Meeting</u>	<u>Committee Motion referred to / date/ decision of Committee</u>	<u>Action taken / Proposed Future Action</u>	<u>Responsible Head(s) of Service</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Is authority sought to remove motion from list?</u>
	<p>structure of traffic speed controls within the city of Aberdeen. Such a study should start from the principle of having all housing sub divisions designated as 20mph traffic zones within arterial or main roads being designated as 30 or 40mph maximum speed zones.</p> <p>The objective is to create standardisation in the interests of road safety and to alleviate confusion in the minds of drivers. This has become necessary due to the vast array of speed bumps, mandatory 20mph roads and advisory 20mph roads. As a result of these changes it is intended to educate the public in terms of safe driving. The working group should comprise Council officers and token Councillor representation, reporting to Council or Committee</p>		Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure Committee, and to agree that a Working Group should not be established for this purpose.	<p>with further information on:- (a) the blanket city wide 20mph for residential uses implemented by Portsmouth Council; (b) traffic controls implemented by other comparable cities; and (c) the prosecution rates for motorists exceeding the existing 20mph speed limit in the city.</p> <p>A report is included on this agenda.</p>			

<u>No.</u>	<u>Motion</u>	<u>Date of Council Meeting</u>	<u>Committee Motion referred to / date/ decision of Committee</u>	<u>Action taken / Proposed Future Action</u>	<u>Responsible Head(s) of Service</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Is authority sought to remove motion from list?</u>
	as necessary.”						